

Applicant: Sandeep Gulati
Serial No.: 10/677,403
Filed: October 1, 2003
Page: 11 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 18329-004004

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claim amendments are presented herein to obviate the current rejection.

35 USC § 112

Claims 2, 3, and 5 have been rejected as allegedly failing to comply with 35 USC § 112, first paragraph. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, in an effort to expedite allowance of the current application, claims 3, and 5 have been clarified to cover interferometric signal processing. With regard to claim 2, it is respectfully noted that this claim is a means-plus-function format claim and there is sufficient corresponding structure, material or acts in the specification disclosure to enable the subject matter defined by claim 2 and that the skilled artisan would know how to make and use the claimed subject matter based on the specification.

Claim 2 has been rejected as allegedly failing to comply with 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, claim 2 has been

Applicant: Sandeep Gulati
Serial No.: 10/677,403
Filed: October 1, 2003
Page: 12 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 18329-004004

clarified to recite tessellation means for tessellating the output pattern to facilitate signal processing.

35 USC § 102

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by Cabib. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cabib fails to disclose, inter alia, an interferometric unit configured to generate an interference between the pre-conditioned digitized output pattern and a reference wave to enhance the digitized output pattern as recited in claim 2. With Cabib, the reference to pixels does not pertain to a digitized image, but rather, describes a location of a sample that is emitting light (see, inter alia, Cabib claim 1, element (i)). In addition, the interferometer system of Cabib generates interferences using incident light collimated therethrough as opposed to the interferometric unit as defined by claim 2 which generates interferences with a digitized output pattern (which is different than collected incident light) and a reference wave.

Accordingly, claim 2 should be allowable.

Applicant: Sandeep Gulati
Serial No.: 10/677,403
Filed: October 1, 2003
Page: 13 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 18329-004004

Double Patenting

Enclosed herewith are terminal disclaimers with regard to U.S. Pat. App. No. 10/616,869, U.S. Pat. No. 6,671,625, and U.S. Pat. No. 6,136,541. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the double patenting rejections be withdrawn.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Kindly change the Attorney Docket Number for this matter to: 18329-004004.

Applicant: Sandeep Gulati
Serial No.: 10/677,403
Filed: October 1, 2003
Page: 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 18329-004004

Please apply \$195.00 for the fees associated with the
Terminal Disclaimer's and apply any other charges or credits to
deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 4/20/05

Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Fish & Richardson P.C.
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10499510.doc